

The Principia.

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government, and the Economy of Life.

VOL. I.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 2, 1860.

NO. 29.

The Principia

Published Weekly, at 339 Pearl Street, (two doors above
Harpers' Buildings) New-York.

WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor.

SAMUEL WILDE, Proprietor.

TERMS: One Dollar a year, in advance.

Direct business letters, with remittances, to

MELANTHON B. WILLIAMS, Publishing Agent,
as above.

PROSPECTUS.

Our object, by this publication, is to promote pure religion, sound morals, Christian reforms; the abolition of slaveholding, caste, the rum-traffic, and kindred crimes—the application of Christian principles to all the relations, duties, business arrangements, and aims of life;—to the individual, the family, the Church, the State, the Nation—to the work of converting the world to God, restoring the common brotherhood of man, and rendering Society the type of heaven. Our text book is the Bible; our standard, the Divine law; our expediency, obedience; our plan, the Gospel; our trust, the Divine promises; our panoply, the whole armor of God.

Editors friendly, please copy, or notice.

THE AMERICAN OLIGARCHY—WHEREIN LIES ITS STRENGTH :

NUMBER EIGHT.

THE EMBRYO CASTE OF WHITE SLAVES.

DECLARATIONS OF SLAVHOLDERS, CONTINUED.

Before coming down to the more recent declarations of slaveholders in favor of white slavery, we will present one more specimen from the contemporaries of McDuffie and Calhoun.

HENRY CLAY.—Some will be indignant, and many more will be surprised, at our classification of Henry Clay with those who complacently contemplated the enslavement of white laborers. His early advocacy of gradual emancipation in Kentucky, will be cited in disproof of the allegation. But that effort, if so feeble and transient a movement may be called an effort, shared the fate of other compromising reforms. Mr. Clay, like most other gradualists, settled down into quietism, became an extensive slaveholder, and then, an opponent of all agitation of the subject. He even denied that he had ever favored the abolition of slavery in the more Southerly States. We quote from his famous speech on the anti-slavery petitions, in 1839, in the Senate of the United States.

Speaking of the early movement of abolition in Pennsylvania, and afterwards in Kentucky, he said;

"But if I had been *then*, or were *now*, a citizen of any of the planting States,—the Southern or South-Western States—I should have opposed, and will continue to oppose *any scheme of emancipation, gradual or immediate.*" "Allow me, sir, to glance at the insurmountable *obstacles* which lie in the way of the accomplishment of this end, and at some of the *consequences* which would ensue, if it were possible to attain it." "The first impediment, is the utter and absolute want of all power on the part of the General Government, to effect the purpose." "The next obstacle in the way of abolition, arises out of the fact of the presence, in the slave States, of three millions of slaves." "No practicable scheme for their removal or separation from us, has been yet devised or proposed." "A third impediment to immediate abolition, is to be found in the immense amount of capital which is invested in slave property." "The total value of slave property, by estimate, in the United States, is twelve hundred millions of dollars." "And now it is rashly proposed, by a single fit of legislation, to annihilate this immense amount of property. To annihilate it without indemnity, and without compensation to its owners." "I know that there is a visionary dogma which holds, that negro slaves cannot be the subjects of property. I shall not dwell long on this speculative abstraction. That *is* property, which the law declares *to be* property. Two hundred years have sanctioned and sanctified negro slaves as property."

In opposing the prohibition of the inter-State slave trade, in the same speech, Mr. Clay said:

"The moment the incontestable fact is admitted, that negro slaves are property, the law of moveable property irresistably attaches itself to them, and secures the right of car-

rying them from one to another State, *where they are recognized as property*, without hindrance, whatever, from Congress."

Leaving out the clause, "*where they are recognized as property*" a concession thrown in for temporary use we have in this paragraph, the germe of the claims, since urged, of the right to carry slave property into the Territories, and even into the States, as affirmed in the Lecompton constitution for Kansas.—Pres. Buchanan's affirmation that slavery existed in the *State of Kansas* as truly as in South Carolina and Georgia—the Dred Scott decision—the claim of *Virginia versus New York*, in the Lemon slave case—the proposed slave code of Congress, for the Territories, and the repeal of the laws against the African slave trade." The principle laid down by Mr. Clay, (not accrediting the exception,) completely covers the whole ground. How much weight or permanency he gave to that concession will be seen in his vote for the Fugitive Bill of 1852, wherein the right to seize slave property in the States where slave property is *not* recognized, is the well known design and effect of the enactment.

Mr. Clay in his speech of 1839 above cited, proceeds to enumerate the supposed evils of emancipation, even if practicable, from which, he says, "abolitionists themselves, would shrink back with horror." These evils were, in general, the same as those deprecated by others, and the additional horror (as he expressed it, on another occasion), of a gentleman's being obliged to "black his own boots," or else paying for the service.

But the main point we had in mind, was the inquiry, whether this interminable slavery, in the calculations of Henry Clay, was to be confined to the negroes? On this point, Mr. Clay's speech of 1839, was sufficiently explicit, though expressed with less frankness and straight-forwardness, than Gov. McDuffie's. Hear him.

"It is frequently asked, what is to become of the *African race*, among us? Are they forever to remain in bondage? [He answers.] "Taking the aggregates of the two races, the *European* is constantly, though slowly, gaining upon the *African portion*." "In the progress of time, some one hundred and fifty or two hundred years hence, but few vestiges of the *black race* will remain among our posterity."

What does this mean? What can it mean, but that the mass of the slaves, so continually bleaching by amalgamation with their "owners," as Mr. Clay well knew, are, within two centuries, to become *whites*? The "*African*"—the "*black race*," will have disappeared?

But in what condition are the "*our posterity*" described by Mr. Clay, to be found at the end of the term he specifies? Are they to become free? No! For Mr. Clay had opposed emancipation, "*gradual or immediate.*" He had proved it impracticable. There was no power in the Government to emancipate; the amount of capital invested was too vast to be relinquished, and two hundred years had sanctioned and sanctified the tenure by which they were held. Would "one hundred and fifty, or two hundred years" more of the same legislation, relax the sanctions, or diminish the sanctity of the tenure? Would the constitutional powers of the government to abolish it, be increased? Would the vast amount of capital invested, be diminished? Certainly not.

Mr. Clay knew that the slave population had advanced, between 1790, and 1839,—a period of 49 years,—from less than 700,000 to 3,000,000,—having more than quadrupled in less than fifty years. At that ratio of increase, they would become 12 millions in 50 years more, 48 millions in 100 years, and 192 millions in 150 years. And by the same estimate of increase, if their value was 1200 millions of dollars in 1839, it would become 4800 millions of dollars in 50 years more, or 192 millions in 100 years, or *four times that* amount in 150 years more. Making all the allowance for a decreasing ratio of advance in slave population for the future, that any one could reasonably suggest, it remains un-

deniable that a great increase is to be looked for, and Mr. Clay's estimate of a more rapid increase of the European race, suggests nothing to the contrary. His theory is *not* that the descendants of the slaves are to become extinct, or that they will cease to be slaves.

Mr. Clay did not expect their removal by colonization, though he was President of the American Colonization Society, for he had said, as already quoted, that "No practical scheme for their removal, had yet been devised or proposed." His entire speech was *against "any scheme of emancipation, gradual, or immediate."*—Yet, in the same connection he says, that "some one hundred and fifty, or two hundred years hence, but few vestiges of the *black race* will be found *among our posterity*." The *color* of the servile caste would be changed; a process which is rapidly going on.

The slaves then "*among our posterity*," 150 or 200 years hence, according to Mr. Clay, in this speech *against "any scheme of emancipation"* must, by his own showing, be *whites*? And his whole argument throughout the speech, was against the efforts of abolitionists to put a stop to the process. It is true, that in this same speech, he affected great horror at the idea of "*amalgamation*" which he represented as the natural consequence of abolition. But he knew that "*amalgamation*" was rapidly going on, under slavery, and that there was no *other* way in which "*but few vestiges of the black race*" were likely to "be found among our posterity, in one hundred and fifty, or two hundred years."

To say that Mr. Clay did not understandly and complacently predict the gradual and inevitable exchange of *black slaves*, for *white slaves*, is to suppose, that he neither understood the drift of his own argument, nor the facts and calculations upon which they were based.

For The Principia.

CHURCH ACTION AGAINST SLAVERY.

MR. EDITOR: I am glad to see, by the "*Principia*" for May 5th, that Rev. H. T. Cheever has commenced a series of articles on this subject; and I hope the question will be so thoroughly discussed as to leave no doubt in the minds of your readers as to the *present position* of the various denominations with reference to that monster sin which has so long cursed and demoralized the land. I trust however that in urging the fact that several denominations have, at various times, rigidly excluded slaveholders from their membership, due discrimination will be used, and a mistake into which several anti-slavery writers have fallen, be carefully avoided, viz: that of giving denominations credit for Anti-Slavery action, and a non-slaveholding position, which they are not honestly entitled to. Sometimes the action of a single Conference or Synod has been mistaken for that of a whole denomination. At other times, past action on the subject of slavery has been set down as evidence of the present position of a church. And thus, undesignedly, the public mind has been mislead on so important a question.

Bro. Cheever's recent article in the "*Principia*" upon the position of the New School Presbyterians as regards slavery, induces me to call attention to a very different account of that denomination given by Rev. H. Mattison in his recent work, "*The Impending Crisis of 1860; or the present connection of the Methodist Episcopal Church with slavery &c.*" (N. Y. 1859). Now I have no doubt that Bro. M. is excellent authority with regard to the connection of the M. E. Church with slavery. And after reading his arguments and facts, I cannot dispute but that he sums up the whole matter correctly when he writes: "In the northern portion, the Methodist Episcopal Church proper, we have now some 15,000 slaveholders, holding 100,000 slaves; with slaveholding leaders, stewards, trustees, and local preachers, by hundreds, if not by thousands; it has also entered the trav-

eling ministry, and slaveholders are openly tolerated in several of the Conferences, without the slightest disapprobation."

But in Bro. M's praiseworthy zeal to exterminate slavery from the M. E. Church, and to show how unfavorably her position compares with other denominations in that respect, he has, I fear, drawn his conclusions too hastily with reference to the "Anti-Slavery" character of certain other "Northern Churches." In a section of his work which treats of "The Position taken by several other branches of the Church of Christ in America," Bro. M. after giving an account of the non-slaveholding position which, he asserts, various denominations now occupy, sums up the matter as follows:

"Let us range the Anti-Slavery and Pro-Slavery Northern Churches in parallel columns, that our shame may be the more apparent:

ANTI-SLAVERY CHURCHES.	SLAVEHOLDING CHURCHES.
1. Friends or Quakers.	1. Old School Presbyterian.
2. Free-will Baptists.	2. Protestant Episcopal.
3. United Brethren.	3. Roman Catholic.
4. Associate Presbyterian.	4. Methodist Epis. Church.
5. Wesleyan Methodists.	
6. Orthodox Congregational.	
7. General Baptists.	
8. Ref. Prot. Dutch Church.	
9. New School Presbyterian.	
10. Unitarian.	
11. Universalists.	

This is a faithful representation of the position of the several denominations in America, in regard to the great evil of slavery." (page 109)

Now, if this is a correct and reliable statement, *all* the churches or denominations named in the first column are not only "Anti-Slavery" but also* non-slaveholding. Else they would, necessarily have been placed in the column headed "Slaveholding Churches." Without however dwelling upon the fact that several denominations (such as the Methodist Protestant, the Disciples, [or Campbellites], the Lutherans, the Reformed Presbyterian &c), are altogether ignored in Bro. M's. list, or controverting the position claimed for several denominations in the "Anti-Slavery" column, I will, simply select one, viz: "The New School Presbyterian." To that denomination Bro. Mattison seems to have paid particular attention. After remarking (page 105) that "The New School Presbyterian Church have also purged this great iniquity," Bro. M. quotes the action of the General Assembly, in 1857; recounts the history of the Southern secession at that time, led by Dr. Ross and his followers; and concludes as follows:

"Thus the New School Presbyterian Church has purged itself from slavery, and maintained its honor and Christian character; and it never stood so fair in the public estimation, or was half as prosperous, as it is now. They have done right, and have favor with God and with all good men." (page 108).

Now, remembering the plain statements made by Bro. Cheever in his recent article on the connection of the N. S. Presbyterians with slavery, so recently published in your columns, I would ask, what are we to understand by Bro. Mattison's eulogy? Bro. M. wrote his book at the close of 1858, and seems to have drawn his conclusions from the action of the General Assembly in 1857. I would then, respectfully ask Bro. Cheever, or any other person understanding the matter. Did the N. S. Presbyterian Church, as represented, fully purge itself from the sin of slaveholding at the time of the secession, in 1857. If it did, and slaveholders and a slaveholding Synod have crept into its communion since, Bro. M's statement may be, in some measure, understood. If it did not, then Bro. M. strangely misunderstood the position of that Church, and has been too hasty in bestowing upon it such unqualified praise. I ask for facts with regard to this question, not merely on account of the discrepancy between Bro. Mattison's statement and that of "The Synod of the Free Presbyterian Church," as quoted by Bro. Cheever, but also because of statements put forth by N. S. Presbyterian ministers and members in this city and vicinity. And I wish especially to call attention to the importance of having a correct record as to the actual position of the Churches of Christ on this most important ques-

* Dr. Stevens, Editor of the "Christian Advocate and Journal" maintains that the Methodist Episcopal Church (North) is "an Anti-Slavery Slaveholding Church." According to this idea, Bro. Mattison should have inserted the name of that Church in the column of "Anti-Slavery" as well as "slaveholding" churches!

tion. If Bro. Mattison's exhibit of "Anti-Slavery Churches" could be thoroughly relied upon, it would indeed be a cheering evidence of progress in the right direction. Let us then have light on this subject, and unmistakeable facts bearing upon it, so that no denomination may be praised for holding a position which it does not actually occupy. "The time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God" with reference to that diabolical system which has taken such deep root in American soil. And every denomination ought to be willing to have its true position on the great question of the day "known and read of all men." Then blame would not be attached where it was undeserved, and credit would not be withheld where it was justly due. "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."

Pittsburgh, Pa., May 8, 1860.

J. GREGORY.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.

It is well that Bro. Gregory and others are correcting the mistakes of Bro. Mattison. We were especially surprised at finding "Orthodox Congregationalists" on his list of "Anti-Slavery" Denominations. Having no churches at the South they have indeed no slaveholders, except, perhaps, some who in a way of business have accepted slave property on mortgage, or in payment of debts. But a large portion of Congregational Churches (in New England at least) would make no objection to inviting slaveholders to occasional communion, nor to a ministerial exchange with slaveholding ministers. They make no scruple of supporting the American Board, that supports slaveholding churches, that receives "the price of blood" from slaveholders, and that welcomes slaveholders to a share in its management. The first opposition to the Anti-Slavery movement, in 1833, came from the "Vermont Chronicle" a Congregational paper, edited by Rev. Joseph Tracy, whose slanders did much to excite the great pro-slavery mobs of 1833. He maintained that those who advocated immediate and unconditional emancipation and taught the sinfulness of slaveholding were thereby propagating the infidelity and "Jacobinism of the first French Revolution." For this service he was promoted to the charge of the Boston Recorder, another Congregational paper, and from thence to the New York Observer. Rev. Moses Stuart, Prof. at Andover, was among the early Biblical defenders of slavery and afterwards of the Fugitive Slave bill, along with Prof. Woods. The Christian Mirror another Congregational paper, Portland, Me., edited by Rev. Asa Cummings, maintained that "oral instruction" would suffice for the slaves, without teaching them to read the Bible. As early as 1836-7 measures were taken by the Congregational Associations of Ministers in Connecticut and Massachusetts to exclude Anti-Slavery lecturers from their pulpits. The immediate occasion for this measure was, the efforts of *one of their own number*, Rev. E. R. TYLER, of unquestioned standing and orthodoxy, to get access, as an Anti-Slavery lecturer, to their pulpits, under a commission from the American Anti-Slavery Society, of which ARTHUR TAPPAN, a well known Orthodox Congregationalist, was then President. The interdict was made effectual. Mr. Tyler could gain no considerable access to the churches of New England, and gave up his commission. Of all the professedly evangelical churches in this country, there are few (except the Protestant Episcopal) from which the light of Anti-Slavery truth, in its purity and simplicity has been more systematically excluded than from the orthodox Congregationalists of New England. So lately as the formation of the "Church Anti-Slavery Society" which was formed at Worcester, Mass, in March 1859, it was confidently objected in Convention, to the Platform of the Society, that not over a dozen Orthodox Congregational ministers in New England could be persuaded to subscribe to its declaration of the "inherent sinfulness of slaveholding."

Of the "General Baptists" we have not time to tell the story now. In a book called "Facts for Baptist Churches" it is recorded in documentary form. A brief synopsis may be found in "Slavery and Anti-Slavery" pp. 183 to 190, and 493 to 508. Active Baptist Abolitionists have never considered their Denomination "Anti-Slavery."

One suggestion of a general character, we have to make. The Churches and Denominations whose "Anti-Slavery" is so diluted a character, as to leave its members in the mire of pro-slavery politics, voting for slaveholders, or for pro-slavery candidates, or for candidates pledged to let slavery alone where it already exists, ought to understand one

thing. And that is, that their Anti-Slavery influence is precisely the same as the Temperance influence of those who vote for those who will licence dram-shops. Both are the derision of the pro-slavery and rum politicians who control our municipal, State and National Governments.

The Literary and Theological Review, Edited by Rev. Leonard Woods Jr., was a Congregational Quarterly, and it taught that the "radicals," meaning the abolitionists, were "justly liable to the highest civil penalties and ecclesiastical censures." This was in December, 1835, and was soon after echoed by Gov. M'Duffie of S. Carolina denouncing "death to Abolitionists without benefit of clergy." Mr. Woods was promoted to the Professorship of a college in Maine, under Congregational auspices.

CHURCH ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

FIRST ANNUAL MEETING IN BOSTON.

We have the pleasure of presenting our readers with the spirited proceedings of the Church Anti-Slavery Society, which have just been forwarded to us, by REV. HENRY I. CHEEVER, the Corresponding Secretary, who writes under date of Boston, May 30. The annual Report and Resolutions which follow, were adopted by the meeting. He adds.

"Both Meetings,"—(the morning and the evening)—were largely attended. It was a great success. A deep impression was produced. Collections, \$90.00.

REPORT of the SECRETARY of the CHURCH ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

PRESENTED MAY 29th, 1860, AT THE MEETING IN BOSTON.

In presenting their first Annual Report to the Church Anti-Slavery Society, the Executive Committee find reason to declare, that while the direct achievements of the Society, from the lack of material resources at their command, are by no means equal to their desires; and while the expressed concurrence and favor of the Churches and the Ministry, have been far less than was to have been naturally expected,—the indirect results of the formation of the Church Anti-slavery Society, a little more than one year ago, have been in the highest degree gratifying to the friends of Freedom and Christianity.

Through their Secretary, in the course of the year, the Committee have issued and circulated nearly 1500 copies of a Letter, directly addressed to the Churches, calling attention to the principles and plans of the society, and recommending, especially, organization, and expression by the Churches, in one form or other, against slavery. Besides this, there have been distributed a large number of the pamphlet of Proceedings of the Worcester Convention, together with the address embodying the views of that Convention. The Committee have also procured the publication of the Society's Prize Tract, by Isaac Allen,—showing that the Bible gives no warrant or allowance of slavery—through the Boston American Tract Society, which they are now circulating. And they have offered another premium of \$100—with which they have been intrusted for the purpose—for the best tract upon the question, "How shall Northern Churches and Christians absolve themselves from all responsible connection with slavery?"

Through the Secretary, there have been held twenty-four public meetings, in behalf of the Society, at different points and he has furnished eighty articles to the Newspaper Press in elucidation of the principles and objects and doings of the Society. He has procured also, pledges toward the support of an agency, to the amount of \$900, of which \$417 have been paid. He has also procured the formation of Auxiliary Societies at important centres, especially in the State of Pennsylvania, and the passage, by large public meetings, of Resolutions of sympathy with our persecuted anti-slavery white brethren of the South, ministers of the Gospel and teachers, and with the colored exiles of Arkansas, compelled by an act of the Legislature to leave the land of their birth, or become slaves. Moreover, by a large correspondence with representative-men in different parts of the country, as well as through the religious and secular press, he has endeavored to make known, and awaken an interest in, the specific work of the Society, viz: *To unite all Christians on the basis of the Holy Scriptures as divinely inspired, against slavery; and to concentrate the energies of the Christian Ministry, and of Christian Churches, upon the extinction of our great national sin.*

Your Co
rising of t
synods, an
fervent pro
parts of the
cannot thin
tion of the
eration an
saints, and
such mighty
proscription

And you
ing sign of
general or t
would seem
and the Chu
potism. Ou
honor from
for the felon
pending Cris
to his experi
us his views
fire-engine c
effectually to
South.

Your com
a greatly in
Journals, in
rial associati
ciety, of refu
of exclusion
slaveholding
human being
ists the crim

And altho
public meeti
try, has defi
declaring th
under simila
preached the
slaveholder w
cognition,—y
associates of
long, the scat
they did not
all the surviv

Your comm
it is such utt
taken by lea
serves, and I
and South, th
er, to bring t
among the pe
force of repub
Christianity, i
fidelity. The
whether the r
and time, are
and seats of o

Last year, d
and he addre
upon this pla
cause of the e
dicial murde
slavery has m
calendar of ou
have to say to
"You, orthodo
meant to destr
bent upon its q
quarter in the
can be any Bil
moment for slav
of words. Yo
be free. We
very is to tun

Honestly and
Society, we ha
through the C
peaceful overv

Your Committee have looked in vain, to see a general uprising of the Northern churches, conferences, associations, synods, and other ministerial and ecclesiastical bodies, in fervent protest against the outrages upon Christian liberty, which have been perpetrated upon our brethren in different parts of the South. Although there may have been—we cannot think but there must have been—a silent insurrection of the Northern Christian conscience, against the incarceration and banishment of those “fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God,”—there has been no such mighty movement of God’s people against injustice and proscription, as was to have been rationally expected.

And your committee cannot but regard as the most alarming sign of the times, what,—so far as the absence of any general or earnest expression upon the subject can indicate, would seem to be the lamentable apathy of the Ministry and the Churches, to the encroachments and crimes of despotism. Our brother Rev. DANIEL WORTH, on his parole of honor from the Carolina jail, (in which he lay for months, for the felony of disposing of four copies of Helper’s *Pending Crisis*), will communicate with us to-day, in respect to his experience in the Southern prison-house, and will give us his views as to how and where we are to stand, with the fire-engine of Northern anti-slavery principle, so as most effectually to play upon the consuming fire of slavery in the South.

Your committee are especially gratified in reporting that a greatly increased attention is being given, in the Religious Journals, in the Churches, and in ecclesiastical and ministerial associations, to the great principle inculcated by this Society, of refusing Christian fellowship to slaveholders, and of exclusion from the Christian Church, for the practice of slaveholding, *on account of the inherent sinfulness of holding human beings as property*, which defines, and in which consists the crime of slaveholding.

And although a distinguished Doctor of Divinity, at a late public meeting in the commercial metropolis of our country, has defied the moral sense of Christendom, by boldly declaring that he had himself bought and sold slaves, and under similar circumstances, would do so again; that he preached these views from his pulpit, and that being a slaveholder was not a matter of controversy or Church recognition,—yet, would that Minister and his like-minded associates of the Old School Presbyterian Church, feel, ere long, the scathing condemnation of the Church universal, if they did not already experience the withering contempt of all the surviving manhood of the country.

Your committee are compelled to add, that in their view, it is such utterances and such an attitude toward slavery, taken by leading representative Ministers, Editors of Observers, and Elders, in different parts of the country, North and South, that is doing more than all other causes together, to bring the Church and the ministry into contempt among the people, if not to carry many of them by the mere force of repulsion, from such a slaveholding semblance of Christianity, into the, at least, humane embrace of modern infidelity. The question is worthy of grave consideration, whether the real infidels and infidel makers of our country and time, are not to be found in some of the boasted oracles and seats of orthodoxy.

Last year, JOHN BROWN was present at our deliberations, and he addressed this Society in a few characteristic words upon this platform. Were the lamented martyr in the cause of the enslaved, again with us, to-day,—by whose judicial murder upon the gallows, the unrelenting Moloch of slavery has made the last year a Red Letter year, in the calendar of our country’s history,—we think he would not have to say to us, as he did to some in this assembly, then, “You, orthodox, do not undertake against slavery, as if you meant to destroy the monster. Let me see you resolutely bent upon its destruction, by denying it any fellowship or quarter in the Church. Let me see you denying that there can be any Bible, or Christianity, or law, or leniency, one moment for slavery, before I can go with you. I am weary of words. You must do something, if the enslaved are to be free. We must strike, if the Bastile of American slavery is to tumble.”

Honestly and earnestly, ever since our organization as a Society, we have tried to do something against slavery, through the Churches, as being the legitimate agency, for its peaceful overthrow: yet with small show of success. But,

whatever may have been our inefficiency and short-comings, JOHN BROWN, with his high disinterested motives, and from his peculiar stand-point, must be acknowledged to have bravely and effectively done and suffered in behalf of the enslaved. And being dead, he yet speaketh, and calleth us to-day, to the fight for freedom with the divine weapons, which himself handled with more fatal force against slavery, than pike or rifle,—*the weapons which are not carnal, but spiritual, and mighty through God, to the pulling down of strongholds*.

The Church Anti-slavery Society, points the Churches to-day to a more excellent way than the great American Martyr of 1859 took, to make an end of slavery, and to the only way to prevent the recurrence of such disastrous attempts in other parts of the South, as that at Harper’s Ferry, viz: for Christian Churches, of all denominations, at once, and earnestly, to undertake the deliverance of the enslaved, by means purely moral and peaceful. And the Christian mission of the Church Anti-slavery Society, will have been accomplished, when the great body of churches of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in the U. S., have taken the attitude in regard to slaveholding and slaveholders already taken and steadily maintained for years, by the Society of Friends, the, Wesleyan Methodist Connection, the Free Will Baptists, the United Brethren in Christ, the Reformed Presbyterian Church, the United Presbyterian Church, and the Free Presbyterian Church. All these churches, numbering about 315,000 members, and 3,500 ministers, make slaveholding a “disownable” offence, and a bar to membership, and communion.

*It is gratifying to your committee to be able to report that, during the past year, a number of Congregational Churches have adopted the same principle, refusing to recognize or receive as Christians, or Christian ministers, those who hold property in man. A new Orthodox Anti-Slavery paper, called the PRINCIPIA, has also been established during the year, at New York. It ably advocates the principle of the inherent sinfulness of slaveholding, and argues the duty of non-communion with slaveholders, as the Christian means of bringing them to repentance. It is under the Editorial charge of Rev. WM. GOODELL, the veteran champion of freedom and humanity, whose public career as a writer, began with his newspaper articles against the Missouri Compromise, as far back as 1820. His eye is not dim nor his natural force abated. He urges earnestly the claims of this Society upon the Churches, and argues conclusively, from first principles, the duty of non-fellowship.

May God, by his Spirit and Providence, speedily bring all the Churches to the adoption of this rule, until slavery itself shall expire under the irrepressible opprobrium of the Church universal, and the enfranchisement of four millions of American slaves, shall be the most glorious achievement of Christianity hitherto recorded in the annals of mankind!

For this Society to become an efficient handmaid of Christianity in this great enterprise, it must be supplied with resources through material aid and co-operation, from those who believe with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, who addressed a public meeting in behalf of this Society, last Autumn, *that in the rallying of the Churches and of the religious sentiment of the country against slavery, lies the only hope of its overthrow without convulsion and blood*.

Measures of vital importance to the usefulness of the Society, and plans of operations for the ensuing year, will be presented at the Business Meeting of the Society, at the Meionaon, at 3 o’clock this afternoon, when a prompt attendance is requested by the Committee, of all friends and members of both sexes.

In behalf of the Executive Committee,
HENRY T. CHEEVER, Secretary.

RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

1. *Resolved*, That when politicians of the most advanced political school or party in our country, are coolly asserting that the only solution which the question of African slavery admits of, among us, is the “confessedly cruel and unchristian process of driving them out”—it is time for the friends of God and man, who are opposed on grounds of eternal justice, to any solution of this question, that is cruel and unchristian, to make themselves heard against such a policy; and so much the more, because it is gravely argued, that, although the philanthropy and mercy of sensitive hearts, may wail out their protests against its sin and its miseries, yet the fast-rooted system of American slavery, so laughs to scorn all the notions of humanity, and so threatens, if slavery be touched, “to pull down the pillars of the political communities associated together, under a common govern-

ment, that it will not do to entertain the question of the immediate emancipation of the servile race, where they are found.”

2. *Resolved*, further, That when it is seriously maintained “that the separation of the white and black races, is all important as a means of promoting national harmony and progress;” and when the idea of “negro equality,” and of a common participation, by the black man, in the protection and privileges of a free government, is ignored or scoffed by political speculators and journalists, as belonging only to dreamers and enthusiasts,—it is time for men of principle and men of prayer, who believe that God hath made of one blood *all* nations of men, for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and that the *rights of man as man, are sacred and inalienable, without distinction of blood or races*,—it is time for such Christian men, of all sects and denominations, to protest unitedly against these infidel views, in the name of our common Christianity, as being a practical denial of the fatherhood of God, and the common brotherhood of man.

3. *Resolved*, That it is for the Church Anti-slavery Society, in the name of Christ, and as acting in behalf of the great company of *fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God*, everywhere to erect a breakwater against the infidel views, in regard to “negroes, and the descendants of negroes,” which are becoming alarmingly prevalent in Church and State.

4. *Resolved*, That in the judgement of this meeting, there is grave reason to fear that the decisions of our judiciary, respecting “negroes and the descendants of negroes,” which have contravened, not only the first principles of Natural Justice, but the very cardinal notions of Christianity itself; and the recent slurs in the United States Senate, at the protest and plea of a Christian conscience against usurpation, (a plea, by reason of which we are a Republic, to-day, because, in the language of Senator Hale, “Men were found in the olden times who set up their consciences against the law of the existing governments,”) there is grave reason to fear, that these, and other alarming strides of despotism, will bring the Christianity and the government into conflict, and if not arrested, will ultimately array Christian Churches, and Christian ministers, against the unchristian laws and policy of the land.

5. *Resolved*, That we therefore deem it to be a legitimate work of the Church Anti-slavery Society, to rouse, and give expression to the Christian conscience of the nation against slavery, and against whatever Legislative or Judicial Acts, or Decisions, are contrary to God’s Law, and to Natural Justice, and by so doing, **TO MAKE THE CHRISTIAN ELEMENT OF THE COUNTRY MORE POTENTIAL IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS, AND TO PERVERSE, IF POSSIBLE, THE REALM OF POLITICS WITH THE PRINCIPLES OF RELIGION.**

ADDITIONAL RESOLUTIONS, ADOPTED IN THE EVENING.

Whereas, At the moment we are assembled to discuss, with unfettered freedom, all the aspects of our great national sin, and its relation to our Government, there lies incarcerated in the Washington jail, at the order of the U. S. Senate, an eminently worthy citizen of the United States, for the alleged crime of refusing to acknowledge the right of a Senatorial Committee to compel him to testify, at their bidding, in the interest of slavery; therefore we, in behalf of many Christian freemen insulted in his person, would take this occasion to proffer him our warm sympathy, and our grateful acknowledgements for the integrity and firmness with which he has resisted a most dangerous usurpation of the Senate, at the behest of slavery.

Resolved, That while we are justly indignant at the betrayal of liberty in this case, by honorable Senators from the North, who took an unworthy and unlooked for part in procuring the incarceration of our honest fellow-citizen, we have no language left to stigmatize the baseness of others, who would turn away the public odium from the authors and abettors of this outrage, by slurring at the position of Mr. Hyatt, as that of a mock philanthropist, envious of the glory of martyrdom. Incapable of believing that in the evil days of venality and corruption, on which we have fallen, any one can be found to stand and suffer for a principle, they are forced to seek a motive for a disinterested act of courage and patriotism, in the realm of selfishness and vanity.

Resolved, That we congratulate the friends of Freedom, that there is found among us a Hampden, who not only refuses to pay ship-money to Charles, but freely offers his own money from the prison-house of tyranny, for the best legal and popular essay upon the very question, for the assertion of which he is in bonds, and we trust that the motto of the noble Hampden—*Nulla vestigia Retrosum*—will be maintained to the last, by our suffering brother, with the uncompromising resolution to linger, and if need be, die in prison, sooner than to purge himself of the alleged crime of contempt of the U. S. Senate, “by perjuring himself before God,” in declaring that he believes the self-constituted Court of the Senate to have the Constitutional right and authority to compel him to make answer to their interrogations.

Ohio, April 24.—“I enclose one dollar for your paper. When the time for which it pays, expires, I will remit, again; for I feel it my duty to support with my money and influence, a paper that will tell the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.”

The Principia.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 2, 1860.

CHRISTIAN SIMPLICITY.

"For our rejoicing is this, the testimony of our consciences that in simplicity and godly sincerity, not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God, we have had our conversation in the world, and more abundantly to you-ward."—*Paul to the Corinthians, ii. Epist. i. 12.*

The word *conversation* here, means something more than mere talking with other persons. It means "General course of manners, behavior, deportment, especially as it respects *morals*"—[Webster.] Of course it includes *morals* in the extensive and important sphere of government and politics.

Simplicity is "singleness, the state of being unmixed, and uncompounded"—"Artlessness of mind, freedom from propensity to cunning or stratagem, freedom from duplicity, sincerity,"—In religion, the union of profession with practice, "with a single view to obedience and the glory of God."—*Webster—Hooker.*

A noble and lovely trait of character, as must be admitted by all. But is it consistent with wisdom? Yes; with "the wisdom that cometh from above," but not with "the wisdom of this world, which is foolishness with God."

Worldly men, worldly professors of religion, worldly ecclesiastics, worldly politicians, do not think so. They imagine they must needs "take the world as it is"—use a little craft and cunning—resort to stratagem, carry a double face, and make use of a double tongue. Otherwise they could not carry their ends. Worldly religionists, like other worldlings, justify and command this policy as necessary. See how they argue.

"Mr. So and So, in his speech in Congress, made such and such concessions to the Slave power,—concessions which, every one knows, must prove fatal to his professed advocacy of the cause of freedom. How can I vote for him?"

"Well, now, you must consider that it was necessary for him to concede this, so as to avoid enraging "the South," raising a clamor against himself, preventing his nomination or his election. But he intends no such thing. *His heart is with us*, and when he gets possession of power, he will do all we require. *I know*, for I have talked with him, and am well acquainted with him. I shall vote for him, and hope you will. You can do it with perfect safety."

"So you think you can trust him to tell you the truth in private, while you believe he tells a lie to the public! And you think he will feel himself bound by his private assurances, rather than by his public declarations! This *may* be wisdom, but it must be the wisdom of this world. Of all the untrustworthy characters, of all the dangerous politicians on earth, the one you describe, and for whom you invite me to vote, is the most so. You can trust him, and, according to your own account of the matter, you can trust him because you believe him to be a deceiver, a liar!—No marvel that *such* wisdom should be "foolishness with God!" It is the most foolish and insane thing in the world."

Such, in substance, have been the conversations we have held with professing christians and ministers, scores of times, within a few years past.

If this be Christian "simplicity and godly sincerity," what are their opposites? Where are they to be found? By what characteristics are they to be distinguished? In what acts and utterances are they to be manifested? In what language, or by what illustrations are they to be described?

What has become of "simplicity and Godly sincerity," when Church members and ministers,—not the pro-slavery, but the anti-slavery portion of them,—give currency and practical exemplification to maxims and methods of reformatory activity like these?

Christian "simplicity, and Godly sincerity!" What exhibition of the wonders of antiquity, introduced into the arena of commercial life, among salesmen, in the counting house, on the Exchange, in Wall street, at the Board of Bank and RailRoad Directors could produce the sensation, or excite the astonishment that would instantly be produced by the introduction of Christian "simplicity and Godly sincerity," as the guides of commercial and financial life? How could business, as now conducted, go on, at all?

By Christian "simplicity and Godly sincerity,"—"not by fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God"—how could Church building, pew-selling, pew-renting, settling and unsettling ministers, choosing Deacons, Trustees, appointing class leaders, licensing, ordaining, installing and stationing ministers, be "judiciously managed" so as best to promote the interests of "our denomination" and "build up" the — Church in — street, with the "most solid and respectable class of society?" For—consider—*how*, with Christian "simplicity, and Godly sincerity," could we have the negro-pew, the poor man's pew, (or no places at all for such worshippers?)—how should we get the most popular preacher, or find the means of supporting him? With Christian "simplicity, and Godly sincerity," how shall the preacher attract the cotton-merchants, the money-changers, the office-holders in the office-seekers? How shall he avoid giving offence to

"Mr. Purse and Mr. Rich,
"Who dressed the pulpit, every stitch,
"And Doctor Pomp, and Colonel Swell,
"Who gave the organ and the bell?"

Above all, how shall we sell or rent the pews to ladies of fashion, and "gentlemen of property and standing?"—Paul, Paul! Thou art beside thyself! Much study, and radicalism, doth make thee mad!

Christian "simplicity, and Godly sincerity," in Chair of State, in the Cabinet, in the Senate, in the House of Representatives, in the caucus, in the Nominating convention, at the ballot box—"Christian simplicity"—"singleness, the state of being unmixed, uncompounded," unadulterated, uncompromised—"artlessness of mind, freedom from propensity to cunning or stratagem, freedom from duplicity, sincerity,"—the union of profession with practice, "a single view to obedience, and the glory of God"—the God who says, "Break every yoke, let the oppressed go free!"—"He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God"—"Judges and officers shall thou make thee in all the gates which the Lord thy God giveth thee, throughout thy tribes, and they shall judge the people," (all of them) with just judgment!" Who ever heard of such a thing? Who, but a "hair-brained fanatic, an impracticable," ever dreamed of such a thing? How, with "simplicity and Godly sincerity," could we get "available" candidates, with double or treble tongues,—one for the public, and one or two for closet use? How should we construct ambiguous, pie-bald platforms, to catch opposite classes of voters? How shall political party leaders, do this, while leaders of ecclesiastical politics, patch up ambiguous Resolutions and declarations, in order to keep their heterogeneous ingredients and constituency, together?

Seriously.—Are we to have no "simplicity, and Godly sincerity," left among us? In our religion, our politics, (civil and ecclesiastical,) in our daily business, in our commercial affairs, in our monied corporations, in our counting houses, our banks, our halls of Legislation, our courts of justice, are we to have no Christian "simplicity, and Godly sincerity" remaining? We ask professors and ministers of religion—especially do we ask that portion of them who profess to be progressive, reformatory, anti-slavery, friends of the Temperance reformation—seeking the overthrow of the Rum power and the Slave power. Do you mean what you profess? Do you expect to have the community believe you? Can you look round upon the audiences and congregations in which you have preached or worshipped, who have witnessed your "conversation in the world," especially to them-ward, and address to them the above cited language of Paul to the Corinthians? Can you? And will they bear witness to you, of your "simplicity, and Godly sincerity?"

THE PROPOSED REPUBLICAN PRESIDENT.

Desirous, as we are, that our readers, and that all abolitionists and free-soilers should understand correctly, from the best authority, the position of the Republican candidate in respect to the great objects they have been so long laboring for, we give to-day, an authentic statement of "MR. LINCOLN'S OPINIONS," from the *Tribune*. If any abolitionist or free-soiler, professing to remain such, can give it an attentive consideration, and then give his vote for Mr. Lincoln, we can only say that we know not how to vindicate the sincerity of his professions, except by entertaining a less elevated conception of his intelligence.

THE DISAPPOINTED ASPIRANTS.

Among the Republican Statesmen whose friends were expecting their nomination to the Presidency, Mr. Seward and Mr. Chase were, undoubtedly, the most prominent. The usages of party require that, in such cases, the losers in the competition shall submit with a good grace; and considering the high standing of the two gentlemen just named, and the comparative obscurity and inferior qualifications of their successful competitor, it must be admitted that they are surviving the shock, as well as could have been expected. A letter of the one and a speech of the other, have expressed their submission to the decisions of the Convention. We deem it but just and proper to record them. And, in their approval of the Chicago Platform, abolitionists will see how little, if indeed any thing, would have been gained to the cause of humanity and liberty, by the nomination or election of either of them instead of Lincoln.

MR. SEWARD'S LETTER, as published in the *Times* is said to contain his pledge of hearty support to Lincoln and Hamlin. Our readers will judge for themselves of the cheerfulness and heartiness of the pledge. We see little in it but philosophical submission to necessity. The Platform seems more heartily endorsed by him than the candidates. Mr. CHASE in his speech, makes no secret of his dissatisfaction with the fluctuating course of the Delegation of Ohio who readily deserted him. His endorsement however, of the candidates is more hearty and emphatic than Seward's.

ARRIVAL OF REV. J. S. GREEN.—We omitted to mention last week, the arrival of Rev. JONATHAN S. GREEN, from the Sandwich Islands. Mr. Green is a brother of the Rev. BERIAH GREEN, so long known, and so conspicuous in the anti-slavery enterprise in this country. His brother of whom we now speak, has been equally decided and out-spoken on the same subject, in the land of his sojourn, as his numerous letters, published in this country, bear testimony. He was for a long time a Missionary of the American Board, but felt constrained to leave its service, many years since, and has since labored either in connection with the American Missionary Association, or by self-support, and the aid of the native Church to which he ministers, and which he contributed and forwarded funds for the support of the anti-slavery cause in America. Mr. Green visits his native country, after an absence of thirty-two years, having recently buried his wife in the land of their long residence, to which he intends to return. The friends of human freedom and of a pure Gospel in this country, will gladly greet a devoted and able fellow laborer, as JONATHAN GREEN.

THE TWO DEMOCRATIC CONVENTIONS.—The public expectation is now turned to the two rival Democratic conventions, about to be held: the ultra pro-slavery one, at Richmond, Va., commencing on Monday next, June 4th, and that of the Douglas party at Baltimore, two weeks later, June 18th. On the action of these two bodies, the question is pending, whether the two wings of the late great Democratic party can be re-united, or whether they will remain divided. And on this may hinge the prospects of Republican success in November.

HAYTI, CAYUGA Co.

Friend GOODELL: I have just perused, in the Principia, the letter of our restored friend and brother, Gerrit Smith, and while I am rejoiced at his resurrection, and hope he may live a thousand years, enjoying health and happiness to the end,—there is one thing in his letter, that may possibly work injury to the public, to which I desire to call the attention of your readers. Mr. Smith speaks in the highest terms of not only Dr. Gray, but of the Institution generally. He says—"The Institution appears to me to be controlled by wisdom and love."

No doubt Mr. Smith has every reason to speak thus, and does it in sincerity and truth; but we all know how utterly impossible it was for him to know anything not connected with himself. Mr. Smith's wealth and position, of course, secured to him everything possible or desirable—but that does not disprove what has come to be pretty generally believed—that the *insane poor receive very different treatment*. The Lunatic Asylum at Utica, is charged with most *brutal and cruel treatment to its poor inmates*—and so deeply agitated is the public mind on this subject, that a Committee was appointed by the last Legislature, to investigate the

matter—

brother Smith
own case, IWe know
ther than as
membrance
proposed.
if so, what,DEATH OF
the death of
n the 50th y
but it declin
ed for someHOMESTEAD
the Homeste
rence. So t

SAMUEL H

The Centr
lowing letter
itation to a
Messrs. LineGENTLEMEN
with which I
many other r
sions of rene
will remain v
though I was
the vindicatio
nevertheless,
wise, and patrSuch assur
now existing,
fact that they
correspondenc
You will at o
come painful
they should b
al form of ma
ful and consis
have delayed
tunity of maki
ington, after
upon my dweThe same r
invitation to a
demonstratio
ering the nom
National Con
your right to o
opinions and sMy friends
generously ma
exclusive care
so as to be ab
them into the
public confide
eage Conventio
pointment, the
may have fou
for who in any
claim that a g
its candidate f
people? I fin
form as satisfac
my own hands,
and able Repu
rated in mainta
lent creed. I

support.

matter—and knowing the utter impossibility of our good brother Smith's knowing much of anything outside of his own case, I deem it right and just to make these remarks.

Yours for the right, W. O. DUVALL.

We know nothing of the above mentioned charges, farther than as the letter of Mr. Duvall revives a faint remembrance that the appointment of such a Committee was proposed. Whether the committee has ever reported, or, if so, what, we remain uninformed.—EDITOR.

News of the Day.

DEATH OF THEODORE PARKER.—The papers announce the death of Rev. Theodore Parker, at Florence, May 10, in the 50th year of his age. He went abroad for his health but it declined, and the news of his death had been expected for some time, by his friends in Boston.

HOMESTEAD BILL.—In the Senate, the amendments of the Homestead Bill, by the House, were refused a concurrence. So the Bill is defeated for the present.

SAMUEL HOUSTON.—The friends of Samuel Houston, in this city, held a meeting at Union Square, on Tuesday evening, to forward his nomination for the Presidency. There seems no danger of a lack of candidates, such as they are.

MR. SEWARD'S LETTER.

The Central Republican Committee has received the following letter from Hon. Wm. H. Seward, in reply to an invitation to attend a meeting to ratify the nomination of Messrs. Lincoln and Hamlin:

AUBURN, May 21, 1860.

GENTLEMEN: I will not affect to conceal the sensibility with which I have received the letters in which you and so many other respected friends have tendered to me, expressions of renewed and enduring confidence. These letters will remain with me as assurances in future years that, although I was not unwilling to await, even for another age, the vindication of my political principles, yet that they did, nevertheless, receive the generous support of many good, wise, and patriotic men of my own time.

Such assurances, however made, under the circumstances now existing, derive their priceless value largely from the fact that they steal upon me through the channels of private correspondence, and altogether unknown to the world. You will at once perceive that such expressions would become painful to me and justly offensive to the community, if they should be allowed to take on any public or conventional form of manifestation. For this reason, if it were respectful and consistent with your own public purposes, I would have delayed my reply to you until I could have had opportunity of making it verbally next week on my way to Washington, after completing the arrangements for the repairs upon my dwelling here, rendered necessary by a recent fire.

The same reason determines me also to decline your kind invitation to attend the meeting in which you propose some demonstrations of respect to myself, while so justly considering the nominations which have been made by the recent National Convention at Chicago. At the same time it is your right to have a frank and candid exposition of my own opinions and sentiments on that important subject.

My friends know very well that, while they have always generously made my promotion to public trusts their own exclusive care, mine has only been to execute them faithfully, so as to be able at the close of their assigned terms to resign them into the hands of the people without forfeiture of the public confidence. The presentation of my name to the Chicago Convention was thus their act, not mine. The disappointment, therefore, is their disappointment, not mine. It may have found them unprepared. On the other hand, I have no sentiment either of disappointment or discontent; for who in any possible case could, without presumption, claim that a great national party ought to choose him for its candidate for the first office in the gift of the American people? I find in the resolutions of the Convention a platform as satisfactory to me as if it had been framed with my own hands, and in the candidates adopted by it eminent and able Republicans, with whom I have cordially cooperated in maintaining the principles embodied in that excellent creed. I cheerfully give them a sincere and earnest support.

I trust, moreover, that those with whom I have labored so long that common service in a noble cause has created between them and myself relations of personal friendship unsurpassed in the experience of political men, will indulge me in a confident belief that no sense of disappointment will be allowed by them to hinder or delay, or in any way to embarrass, the progress of that cause to the consummation which is demanded by a patriotic regard to the safety and welfare of the country and the best interests of mankind.

I am, sincerely and respectfully.

Your friend and obedient servant,

WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

To Messrs. Charles C. Nott, Wm. H. Bull, A. J. Williamson, C. S. Spencer and F. W. Shepherd—for the Republican Central Committee.

RATIFICATION MEETING IN COLUMBUS, OHIO.

GOV. CHASE'S SPEECH.

MY FELLOW-CITIZENS: In this mighty gathering and in this all-pervading enthusiasm I see the issue of the campaign.

The manner in which you and your fellow-citizens throughout the country respond to the nominations made at Chicago is a sure presage of success, and I congratulate you upon the cheering prospects before us. The connection of my own name in the National Convention with the nomination for the Presidency renders it proper that I should say that I was placed in that attitude by the action of the Republicans of Ohio, a very large majority of whom in their State Convention presented my name to the Republicans of the Union as their choice for the Presidency. I regard the expression of the State Convention as the law for the State delegation, and so regarding it, had expected of it the same unity of action that characterizes the course of the New-York delegation in the support of Mr. Seward, of the Illinois delegation in the support of Mr. Lincoln, and of the Pennsylvanian delegation in support of Mr. Cameron, under similar instructions. But with the final choice of the Chicago Convention I am entirely satisfied; with its declaration of principles I am satisfied. Every principle in that platform I have publicly avowed and advocated for many years, and its declarations still meet with my cordial concurrence.

It has been said that the nomination of certain candidates might have endangered the success of the course we all have so much at heart. God forbid that my nomination or that of any other man should imperil the triumph of Republican principles! Those principles are dearer to me than all merely personal considerations, and I rejoice that, although I was not nominated, my principles were, and that they have so true and so faithful a representative in the coming contest as Abraham Lincoln of Illinois.

The doctrines of the Republican party are about to receive a triumphant vindication at the hands of the American people. They and those who have advocated them have heretofore been persistently misrepresented; but let me say that even the Slaveholding States themselves, under a wise and patriotic Republican administration, will soon discover the error into which they have been led by these misrepresentations.

For myself, I cherish no hostility toward the people of the Southern States. I would not deprive them of a single right guaranteed to them by the Constitution, nor does the Republican party propose to do so. It simply contends for Freedom in the Territories, against the Southern demand to introduce Slavery there. It believes that Freedom and Free labor will best develop their resources, and contribute most to the welfare and happiness of those who may emigrate thither, from the Slave States as well as from the Free. In the former there is a comparatively small class of slaveholders, while the great majority of white inhabitants are non-slaveholders and poor. We contend that the Territories should be opened to the poor emigrant, whether from the North or the South, and that thus shall be perpetuated a true popular sovereignty, in which the majority shall govern, rather than a class control. In the Southern States there are thousands, kept down by poverty and social distinctions, who long for school and churches, and for unrestricted opportunities of self-culture and elevation in the social scale. We Republicans propose, by keeping the Territories in reserve for them, to furnish them these advantages; and it is a very fortunate and significant circumstance that this leading idea of the Republican creed is so well represented by our candidate.

The life of Mr. Lincoln furnishes an illustration of the operation of that idea. His grand parents were natives of Virginia, his parents of Kentucky, and they were poor. Young Lincoln left the unfriendly atmosphere of Slavery, in his native State, and removed to Indiana, where he could breathe free air and carve out for himself a more favorable destiny. Had he never made the removal, it is scarcely probable that, hampered by the difficulties that surrounded him, he would have risen to the high position he now occupies before the people of the nation. But he came over on to free soil, where generous sympathies awaited the laborer, and helped him on in his upward career. Rising by his own noble efforts, he is to-day the chosen Presidential candidate of the Republican party, and on the 4th of March next he will be the duly chosen President of the United States.

Of the nominee for Vice-President, I can truly say that he is eminently worthy of the confidence reposed in him. I have served with him long in public life, and have known him well. He has been a life-long Democrat—not of the modern type, but of the school of Jefferson and Franklin. His Democracy is not of that kind which consists in subserviency to the dictates of a slaveholding class, and whose highest manifestation is in the alacrity with which its devotees will chase a run-away nigger; but that Democracy upon which our institutions are based; which, towering sublimely above the selfish interest of classes and factions, is enthroned upon the solid foundations of true Popular Sovereignty—the expressed will of an intelligent and patriotic people. I can pronounce upon him no higher eulogium than to say that he is worthy of association upon the same ticket with Abraham Lincoln.

MR. LINCOLN'S OPINIONS.

A correspondent writes to us to inquire what are Mr. Lincoln's opinions concerning the Fugitive Slave Law and the Admission of New Slave States. We are able to answer the question without difficulty. In the discussion between Mr. Lincoln and Judge Douglas at Freeport, Ill., on Aug. 27, 1858, the former took up, one by one, and answered a series of interrogatories relating to all the various points of the Slavery question, and, to leave nothing ambiguous or doubtful, made some additional explanations upon some of them. This part of Mr. Lincoln's speech, delivered on that occasion, is as follows:

"Question 1. 'I desire to know whether Lincoln to-day stands, as he did in 1854, in favor of the unconditional repeal of the Fugitive Slave law.'

"Answer. I do not now, nor ever did, stand in favor of the unconditional repeal of the Fugitive Slave law."

"Q. 2. 'I desire him to answer whether he stands pledged to-day, as he did in 1854, against the admission of any more Slave States into the Union, even if the people want them!'

"A. I do not now, nor ever did, stand pledged against the admission of any more Slave States into the Union."

"Q. 3. 'I want to know whether he stands pledged against the admission of a new State into the Union with such a Constitution as the people of that State may see fit to make?'

"A. I do not stand pledged against the admission of a new State into the Union with such a Constitution as the people of that State may see fit to make."

"Q. 4. 'I want to know whether he stands to-day pledged to the abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia?'

"A. I do not stand to-day pledged to the abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia."

"Q. 5. 'I desire him to answer whether he stands pledged to the prohibition of the slave-trade between the different States?'

"A. I do not stand pledged to the prohibition of the slave-trade between the different States?'

"Q. 6. 'I desire to know whether he stands pledged to prohibit Slavery in all the Territories of the United States, north as well as South of the Missouri Compromise line?'

"A. I am impliedly, if not expressly, pledged to a belief in the right and duty of Congress to prohibit Slavery in all the United States Territories."

"Q. 7. 'I desire him to answer whether he is opposed to the acquisition of any new Territory, unless Slavery is first prohibited therein?'

"A. I am not generally opposed to any honest acquisition of Territory; and, in any given case, I would or would not oppose such acquisition, accordingly as I might think such acquisition would or would not aggravate the Slavery question among ourselves."

"Now, my friends, it will be perceived, upon an examination of these questions and answers, that, so far I have only answered that I was not pledged to this, that, or the other. The Judge has not framed his interrogatories to ask me anything more than this, and I have answered in strict accordance with the interrogatories, and have answered truly that

I am not pledged at all upon any of the points to which I have answered. But I am not disposed to hang upon the exact form of his interrogatory. I am rather disposed to take up at least some of these questions, and state what I really think upon them.

"As to the first one, in regard to the Fugitive Slave law, I have never hesitated to say, and I do not now hesitate to say, that I think, under the Constitution of the United States, the people of Southern States are entitled to a Congressional Fugitive Slave law. Having said that, I have had nothing to say in regard to the existing Fugitive Slave law, further than that I think it should have been framed so as to be free from some of the objections that pertain to it, without lessening its efficiency. And, inasmuch as we are not now in an agitation in regard to an alteration or modification of that law, I would not be the man to introduce it as a new subject of agitation upon the general question of Slavery.

"In regard to the other question, of whether I am pledged to the admission of any more Slave States into the Union, I state to you very frankly that I would be exceedingly sorry ever to be put in a position of having to pass upon that question. I should be exceedingly glad to know that there would never be another Slave State admitted into the Union; but I must add that, if Slavery shall be kept out of the Territories during the territorial existence of any one given Territory, and then the people shall, having a fair chance and a clear field, when they come to adopt their Constitution, do such an extraordinary thing as to adopt a Slave Constitution, uninfluenced by the actual presence of the institution among them, I see no alternative, if we own the country, but to admit them into the Union.

"The third interrogatory is answered by the answer to the second, it being, as I conceive, the same as the second.

"The fourth one is in regard to the abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia. In relation to that, I have my mind very distinctly made up. I should be exceedingly glad to see Slavery abolished in the District of Columbia. I believe that Congress possesses the constitutional power to abolish it. Yet as a member of Congress, I should not, with my present views, be in favor of endeavoring to abolish Slavery in the District of Columbia, unless it would be upon these conditions: First, that the abolition should be gradual; second, that it should be on a vote of the majority of qualified voters in the District; and third, that compensation should be made to unwilling owners. With these three conditions, I confess I would be exceedingly glad to see Congress abolish Slavery in the District of Columbia, and, in the language of Henry Clay, 'sweep from our Capital that foul blot upon our "nation."

"In regard to the fifth interrogatory, I must say here that, as to the question of the abolition of the slave-trade between the different States, I can truly answer, as I have, that I am pledged to nothing about it. It is a subject to which I have not given that mature consideration that would make me feel authorized to state a position so as to hold myself entirely bound by it. In other words, that question has never been prominently enough before me to induce me to investigate whether we really have the constitutional power to do it. I could investigate it, if I had sufficient time to bring myself to a conclusion upon that subject; but I have not done so, and I say so frankly to you here, and to Judge Douglas. I must say, however, that if I should be of opinion that Congress does possess the constitutional power to abolish the slave-trade among the different States, I should still not be in favor of the exercise of that power, unless upon some conservative principle, as I conceive it, akin to what I have said in relation to the abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia."

Such are the opinions of Mr. Lincoln on these important matters. In some respects, they do not accord with our own; but as they are his and not ours, we do not see how we can change them. It will be seen that in regard to the Fugitive Slave law he holds substantially the well-known views of Mr. Corwin; while as regards the admission of new Slave States, his doctrine is the same as has been put forward by Mr. Seward.—*Tribune*.

THE PRO-SLAVERY DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM.

The Resolutions of J. H. Davis have passed the U. S. Senate, by a strictly party vote. It is understood that they were expected to form the basis of the extreme pro-slavery

Democratic Convention, to assemble at Charleston, on the 4th of June, inst. They are as follows.—

1. Resolved, That the adoption of the Federal constitution, the States adopting the same acted severally as free and independent sovereignties, delegating a portion of their powers to be exercised by the federal government for the increased security of each against dangers, domestic as well as foreign, and that any intermeddling by any one or more States, or by a combination of their citizens, with the domestic institutions of the others, on any pretext, whether political, moral or religious, with the view to their disturbance or subversion, is in violation of the constitution, insulting to the States so interfered with, endangers their domestic peace and tranquility—objects for which the constitution was formed—and, by necessary consequence, serves to weaken and destroy the Union itself.

2. Resolved, that negro slavery, as it exists in fifteen States of this Union, composes an important portion of their domestic institutions, inherited from their ancestors and existing at the adoption of the constitution, by which it is recognized as constituting an important element of apportionment of powers among the States, and that no change of opinion or feeling on the part of the non-slaveholding States of the Union in relation to this institution, can justify them or their citizens in open or covert attacks thereon, with a view to its overthrow; and all such attacks are in manifest violation of the mutual and solemn pledge to protect and defend each other, given by the States respectively on entering into the constitutional compact which formed the Union, and are a manifest breach of faith and a violation of the most solemn obligations.

3. Resolved, That the Union of these States rests on the equality of rights and privileges among its members, and that it is especially the duty of the Senate, which represents the States in their sovereign capacity, to resist all attempts to discriminate, either in relation to person or property, so as in the Territories—which are the common possession of the United States—to give advantages to the citizens of one State which are not equally assured to those of every other State.

4. Resolved, That neither Congress nor a Territorial Legislature, whether by direct legislation or legislation of an indirect and unfriendly character, possesses the power to annul or impair the constitutional right of any citizen of the United States to take his slave property into the common Territories, and there hold and enjoy the same while the Territorial condition remains.

5. Resolved, That if experience should at any time prove that the judiciary and executive authority do not possess the means to insure adequate protection to constitutional rights in a Territory, and if the Territorial government should fail or refuse to provide the necessary remedies for that purpose, it will be the duty of Congress to supply such deficiency.

6. Resolved, That the inhabitants of a Territory of the United States, when they rightfully form a constitution to be admitted as a State into the Union, may then, for the first time, like the people of a State when forming a new constitution, decide for themselves whether slavery, as a domestic institution, shall be maintained or prohibited within their jurisdiction; and if Congress admit them as a State, "they shall be received into the Union with or without slaves, as their constitution may prescribe at the time of their admission."

6. Resolved, That the provision of the constitution for the rendition of fugitives from service of labor, "without the adoption of which the Union could not have been formed," and the laws of 1793 and 1850, which were enacted to secure its execution, and the main features of which, being similar, bear the impress of nearly seventy years of sanction by the highest judicial authority, should be honestly and faithfully observed and maintained by all who enjoy the benefits of our compact of Union, and that all acts of individuals or of State Legislatures to defeat the purpose or nullify the requirements of that provision, and the laws made in pursuance of it, are hostile in character, subversive of the constitution, and revolutionary in their effects.

GREELEY VERSUS SEWARD AND RAYMOND

As journalists of the passing history of the times, we must lose sight of nothing that may help to throw light upon the mysterious influences that controlled the Republican Nominating Convention at Chicago. On the other hand, the revelations of the Chicago Convention may reflect light on the darkness of the past and of the future.

At the time of the organization of the Republican party, four years ago, no three names, perhaps, were more prominent, as leaders of the party than the three at the head of this article. GREELEY was its great central journalist, and advocate editorial, in the commercial metropolis. SEWARD was its Nestor in the Senate. RAYMOND was the penman of the Platform adopted by the party at Pittsburg, though modified somewhat, afterward, at Philadelphia. RAYMOND, as Editor of *The Times*, was influential in the party, (as was also BENNETT of *The Herald*) but like Bennett has apparently counted himself outside mostly, since the defeat of Fremont in November, of the same year. Unlike Bennett, however, he seems,

strangely enough, to have been in the interest of SEWARD, and comes up a full blooded Republican, of the progressive stripe, at Chicago, where he encounters GREELEY, the determined and conservative opponent of SEWARD.

Until within a year or two past, we had supposed GREELEY and SEWARD to be fast friends. When it began to appear that *The Tribune* was casting an influence in favor of Bates, we noticed insinuations, in certain quarters, that there had been a personal feud between Greeley and Seward, and that the opposition of the former to the latter was in consequence. We understood *The Tribune*—Mr. Greeley, as we supposed, to contradict the statement. Perhaps the denial was only intended to say that personal feelings had nothing to do with the preference for Bates. Thus matters stood, up to the date of the Chicago Convention.

Soon after the Convention, a Letter signed "R" (Raymond) dated Auburn, May 22, appeared in *The Times* of May 24, commenting on the personal explanation of Mr. Greeley which had previously appeared in *The Tribune*, in his account of the Convention, wherein he, too modestly, as Raymond intimates, repudiates the idea Mr. Seward's defeat was owing mainly to his influence.

Mr. Raymond proceeds to say:

Mr. Greeley was in Chicago several days before the meeting of the Convention, and he devoted every hour of the interval to the most steady and relentless prosecution of the main business which took him thither—the defeat of Gov. Seward. He labored personally with delegates as they arrived—commending himself always to their confidence by professions of regard and the most zealous friendship for Gov. Seward, but presenting defeat, even in New York, as the inevitable result of his nomination.

Mr. Greeley was largely indebted to the forbearance of those upon whom he was waging this warfare, for the means of making it effectual. While it was known to some of them, that nearly six years ago,—in November, 1854,—he had privately, but distinctly, repudiated all further political friendship for and alliance with Gov. Seward, and menaced him with his hostility whenever it could be made most effective, for the avowed reason that Gov. S. had never aided or advised his elevation to office,—that he had never recognized his claim to such official promotion, but had tolerated the elevation of men known to be obnoxious to him, and who had rendered far less service to the party than he had done,—no use was made of this knowledge in quarters where it would have disarmed the deadly effect of his pretended friendship for the man, upon whom he was thus deliberately wreaking the long hoarded revenge of a disappointed office-seeker. He was still allowed to represent to the delegations from Vermont, New-Hampshire, Ohio, Indiana, and other States known to be in favor of Gov. Seward's nomination, that, while he desired it upon the strongest grounds of personal and political friendship, he believed it would be fatal to the success of the cause. Being thus stimulated by a hatred he had secretly cherished for years—protected by the forbearance of those whom he assailed, and strong in the confidence of those upon whom he sought to operate—it is not strange that Mr. Greeley's efforts should have been crowned with success. But it is perfectly safe to say that no other man—certainly no one occupying a position less favorable for such an assault—could possibly have accomplished that result.

In the *Tribune* of Friday May 25, Mr. Greeley replies to Mr. Raymond. He denies having "professed the most zealous friendship for Gov. Seward" at Chicago, denies having said that Seward could not carry the vote of New York, declaring, that he expressly said the contrary. He only feared that he could not carry certain other States. Having copied the charges of Mr. Raymond as above, Mr. Greeley responds: This is a very grave charge; and, being dated "Auburn, Tuesday, May 22, 1860," and written by one who was then expressly and avowedly to console with Gov. S. on his defeat and denounce me as its author, it is impossible not to see that Gov. Seward is its responsible source. I therefore call on him for the private letter which I did write him in Nov., 1854, that I may print it *verbatim* in *The Tribune*, and let every reader judge how far it sustains the charges which his mouth-piece bases thereon. I maintain that it does not sustain them; but I have no copy of the letter, and I cannot discuss its contents while it remains in the hands of my adversaries, to be used at their discretion. I leave to others all judgment as to the unauthorized use which has already been made of this private and confidential letter, only remarking that this is by no means the first time it has been employed to like purpose. I have heard of its contents, or what purported to be their substance, being dispensed to Members of Congress from Gov. Seward's dinner-table in Washington; I have seen articles based on it paraded in the columns of such devoted champions of Gov. Seward's principles and aims as *The Boston Courier*. It is fit that *The N. Y. Times* should follow in their footsteps, but I, who am thus fired from an ambush, demand that the letter, which I have not seen since I sent it, shall no longer be thus employed. Let me have the letter—not a copy, but exactly what I wrote—and it shall appear *verbatim* in every edition of *The Tribune*. The public will then judge how far the use hitherto made of it to my prejudice is justified by its contents. Meantime, I only say that, when I had fully decided that I would no longer be devoted to Gov. Seward's personal fortunes, it seemed due to can-

dor and fair

apprise him of

To this, M

the 26th, and

Monday, the

Courier, tak

ment, at some

carry New Y

tend to per

We need r

zate for the

and oracles s

at such a time

run butting t

feet must be

strange if, like

fails. It rem

injured by the

Seward down

nomination f

gained anythi

sincerely thin

triotic and no

now by Mr. C

ter, it will be

would be belie

would claim

casions profes

regard equali

any man to b

Greeley's reas

may have bee

the dissolutio

lly advertize

ships for the p

The public c

transactions.

have known

arise from co

such partners

let them be du

again, when d

and know how

torially or ot

tend to each o

rum-partners

The letter of

It will come, o

T

Landing of

seized and s

Insurrection

A Vienna to

ination, that p

Marsala on the

were obliged

asserted, previ

not be resume

the shore to t

fighting with

departure.

An official c

ing of two Ne

fillibusters. A

rived, the *Long*

been captured.

who had dise

Other dispa

of Garibaldi,

and destruc

A Turin pa

balt, excusing

monte, and *Lo*

the interests o

forcibly taken

followers.

The Turin jo

to the Italians.

the Marshes, U

revolt, in ord

SEWARD, and
cessive stripe,
terminated and

GREELY
an to appear
or of Balay
at there had
ard, and that
consequence
supposed, to
s only intend
do with the
o the date of

"R" (Rap-
Times of May
Mr. Greeley
in his account
aymond insti-
was owing

the meeting
the interval
he main be-
ov. Seward
rived—con-
professions of
Seward, but
itable result

ence of those
means of ma-
them, that
d privately,
iendship for
with his hu-
the awoke
elevation to
such official
known to be
service to the
knowledge
ly effect of
he was thus
of a dis-
present to the
io, Indiana,
ward's nomi-
t grounds of
ould be fatal
by a hatred
the forbear-
e confidence
not strange
d with suc-
man—cer-
for such as
ult.

replies to
most zeali-
ties having
New York, de-
only feared
ing copied
y responds:

"Auburn,
o was then
his defeat
to see that
call on him
1854, that
leader judge
piece bases
but I have
nts while it
who had disembar-
d confident
ns the fin-
head of its
being dis-
dinner-in-
paraded in
ward's prin-
The N. Y.
n thus fired
I have not
ed. Let me
te—and it
The pub-
f it to my
I only say
ger be due
to care

dor and fair dealing that I should privately but in all frankness apprise him of the fact.

To this, Mr. Raymond replies, in *The Times* of Saturday, the 26th, and Greeley returns to the charge in *The Tribune* of Monday, the 28th. In the mean time, Gen. Webb of *The Courier*, takes up the cudgels against Greeley, but his statement, at some points, corrects those of Mr. Raymond, particularly in this, that Greeley said Seward if nominated, could carry New York. He says, further, that Seward did not intend to permit the use that had been made of Greeley's letter.

We need not follow the controversy farther. It is unfortunate for the Republican party that its three great founders and oracles should get at loggerheads, in such a manner, and at such a time. When two such men as Seward and Greeley run butting their heads together, like a couple of rams, the effect must be stunning, for the moment, and it would not be strange if, like two rams, they should both stagger, if only one falls. It remains to be seen which of the twain will be most injured by the collision, in the long run. Greeley has knocked Seward down, for the time being, so far as the Presidential nomination for 1860 is concerned. Whether Greeley has gained anything by the victory is not so clear. He may very sincerely think that his opposition to Seward was purely patriotic and not personal. But with the facts as they appear now by Mr. Greeley's statement, without waiting for the Letter, it will be difficult for him to make others think so. It would be believing him more disinterested than they themselves would claim to be, or than he would, himself, on ordinary occasions profess to be—more so than most men whom he would regard equally pure minded with himself. It is not easy for any man to be certain of his motives in such cases. Mr. Greeley's reasons for dissolving partnership with Mr. Seward may have been amply sufficient. But it is rather a pity that the dissolution, notified in the private letter, had not been publicly advertized, at the time, as other dissolutions of partnerships for the promotion of "personal fortunes" commonly are. The public ought to be duly apprized of these "business" transactions. As "practical business men" the parties should have known that misunderstandings and wranglings, might arise from covering up matters of this sort. Henceforth when such partnerships in political "fortune" hunting are formed, let them be duly advertized, as the law directs, and advertized again, when dissolved. The people would understand it then, and know how to appreciate the public support, whether editorially or otherwise, that politicians, for value received, extend to each other. Gov. Seward's former experience in that run-partnership, at Auburn, should have been a lesson to him. The letter of Mr. Greeley should have appeared, at the time. It will come, of course, now.

THE SICILIAN INSURRECTION.

Landing of Garibaldi in Sicily—His abandoned vessels seized and sunk by Neapolitan Frigates—Success of the Insurrection—Terrors of Bomba, Jr.

A Vienna telegram of the 14th, states, on reliable information, that part of Garibaldi's expedition disembarked at Marsala on the 11th, from two vessels. The Royal ships were obliged to cease firing during two hours, being, it is asserted, prevented by English steamers. The firing could not be resumed, until the English officers had returned from the shore to their vessels. The volunteers who landed, were fighting with the Royal troops, at the moment of the mail's departure.

An official dispatch of the 13th, from Naples, says the firing of two Neapolitan Frigates off Marsala, killed several filibusters. As regards the two vessels in which they arrived, the *Lombardo* was sunk, and the *Piedmonte* has been captured. The Royal troops marched to meet those who had disembarked.

Other dispatches confirm the news of the disembarkation of Garibaldi, and of the capture of the steamer *Piedmonte*, and destruction of the *Lombardo*.

A Turin paper publishes a letter of Garibaldi to M. Ro-balt, excusing himself for having taken the steamers *Pied-monte*, and *Lombarda*, on the ground that it was done in the interests of the national cause. These steamers were forcibly taken possession of, not chartered, by Garibaldi's followers.

The Turin journals publish a proclamation of Garibaldi to the Italians. Garibaldi calls upon the inhabitants of the Marshes, Umbria, and Sabina, and the Neapolitans, to revolt, in order to divide the forces of the enemy.

Another proclamation addressed to the Romans, recalls the insurrection of 1849, and urges the Romans to act like their brethren who fell in defending Rome.

Col. Medici, the friend of Garibaldi, at Meno, (Genoa,) was forwarding the preparations for a second expedition. Six thousand volunteers were already enrolled.

It was asserted that the numerous diplomatic representations made to Piedmont, would decide the government to prevent the departure of the second expedition.

Great agitation prevailed at Naples.

A Palermo dispatch of the 13th states, that in five churches, at the termination of mass, shouts of "Italy forever!" "Liberty forever," &c., were raised. In the evening the populace, to the number of ten thousand, assembled on the promenade. The police were unable to disperse them, and troops were summoned, who fired on the people, killing four and wounding ten. Several were arrested.

A Turin dispatch states, that during the landing at Marsala, four persons were killed. The arms and ammunition were disembarked. Other arms coming from the Levant, were landed several days before, on the Southern coast.

The Governor of Sicily had issued a proclamation, prohibiting the carrying or detention of arms.

The French Minister at Naples, had asked for four ships of war, and the vessels had been sent.

THE LATEST ACCOUNTS.

Intelligence relative to Garibaldi's expedition, is still meagre and conflicting, but the reports generally concur in stating that he was making good progress. Some say he had captured the most important positions in Sicily, except Messina and Palermo.

After his landing at Marsala, the Neapolitan war vessels bombarded that town without a warning, and the British vessels interposed for the protection of English residents.

The important announcement was made, via Madrid, that the King of Naples had applied for foreign intervention.

Among other questionable rumors, was one that a treaty, offensive and defensive, had been concluded between Naples, Rome, Austria, and all the deposed Italian sovereigns.

The latest accounts from Naples, represent the utmost consternation there. The troops were dispirited. Tumultuous manifestations were taking place, the Royal family packing up their jewels and valuables, and other strong indications that a great insurrection was looked for, at any moment. At the latest dates, Garibaldi's forces were moving on Palermo.

LONDON, Thursday, May 17.

The *Times* has received the following important dispatch from Naples:

"The state of affairs is precarious; the King has requested foreign interference."

PARIS, Thursday, May 17.

The *Pays*, (semi-official,) contains the following confirmation of Garibaldi's success.

"The accounts from Italy announce that Garibaldi's expedition developed itself with extraordinary rapidity. At present, success appears beyond question. Garibaldi was concentrating the scattered limbs of insurrection, and it was asserted that he had captured the most important positions on the island. From other intelligence, it appears that a portion of Garibaldi's expedition landed in Calabria, and that the insurrection was threatening Naples."

EXTRACTS OF LETTERS.

FROM GENESEE CO., N. Y.—I hereby send you one dollar to pay for the *Principia*. I am much pleased with the paper, and wish it could be more generally read. Many that I talk with, object to the emancipation of the colored race because "they don't want them here." Does not this prejudice, existing in the minds of most people, greatly increase the power of the oligarchy? You object, and with good reason, to the definition of slavery as being "that-artistical relation, or civil institution, by which one man is invested with a property in the labor of another," but is not the definition in Webster, quoted from Paley, equally so—as being "the obligation to labor for the benefit of the master," &c. I wonder at the influence of great names on such a man as Dr. Webster, when he believed and taught good sound anti-slavery doctrines, under the word *enslave*, and in his other writings.

"Sound doctrine." Did you ever think that those who practice slaveholding, or teach that it is right, are not orthodox according to St. Paul, 1. Tim. i.—Excuse an old man's disjointed scribblings, and believe me to be ever your friend,

L. B.

Can't suit either of them.

One subscriber, an old patron of the Radical Abolitionist, wrote us, some time since, to know whether we have given up Radical Political Abolition entirely. He is tired of hearing so much about "The Theologies," about ecclesiastical matters, the Church Anti-Slavery Society, and Bible arguments against slavery. We answer him, by the following extracts from another letter, just received from a clergyman.

"I was exceedingly pleased with your *Prospectus*, but it seems to me you tread in the same circumscribed sphere, (political abolition) that you did in the Radical Abolitionist. Though I am a Radical Abolitionist, I confess I am not interested in a perpetual harping upon one string, or dwelling on one theme. I have so much other varied reading, I wish the *Principia* discontinued."

[If the last writer, who is a minister, has such a plentiful supply of "other varied reading," we should have hoped, that, as a "Radical Abolitionist," he could have completed his "variety" by the "Principia," since *no other paper in the country* harps upon that string much, if at all.

We confess we do not give our paper as much variety as we could desire, for want of room. If our friends would help us to more subscribers, we might venture to enlarge.

While one complains that we are not sufficiently political, and another that we are too exclusively so, we must hope that our apportionment is not far out of the way.]

THE CONTENTED FARMER.—Once upon a time, Frederick, King of Prussia, surnamed "Old Fritz," took a ride, and espied an old farmer plowing his acre by the wayside, cheerily singing his melody.

"You must be well off, old man," said the King, "Does this acre belong to you, on which you so industriously labor?"

"No, sir," replied the farmer, who knew not that it was the King. "I am not so rich as that, I plow for wages."

"How much do you get a day?" asked the King still further.

"Eight Groschen," (about twenty cents) said the farmer.

"That is not much," replied the King, can you get along with this?"

"Get along, and have something left."

"How is that?"

The farmer smiled and said, "Well, if I must tell you; two groschen are for myself and wife; and with two I pay my old debts; two I lend away, and two I give away for the Lord's acre."

"This is a mystery which I cannot solve," replied the King.

"Then I will solve it for you," said the farmer. "I have two old parents at home, who kept me when I was weak and needed help, and now that they are weak and need help, I keep them. This is my debt toward which I pay two groschen a day. The third pair of groschen, which I lend away, I spend for my children, that they may receive Christian instruction. This will come handy to me and my wife when we get old. With the last two groschen I maintain two sick sisters whom I would not be compelled to keep—this I give for the Lord's sake."

The King, well pleased with his answer, said:

"Bravely spoken, old man. Now I will also give you something to guess. Have you ever seen me before?"

"Never," said the farmer.

"In less than five minutes you shall see me fifty times and carry in your pocket fifty of my likenesses."

"This is a riddle which I cannot unravel," said the farmer.

"Then I will do it for you," replied the King. Throbbing his hand into his pocket, and counting out fifty bran new gold pieces into his hand, stamped with his royal likeness, he said to the astonished farmer, who knew not what was coming.

"The coin is genuine, for it also comes from our Lord God, and I am his paymaster. I bid you adieu."—German Re-formed Messenger.

When Napoleon was an humble lieutenant, he did not pass his time in idle dreaming what he would do when he should become a general; but, on the contrary, he studied and worked day and night to do all that he could possibly perform, as a lieutenant. He was one of the most diligent and faithful sub-officers ever known; and when Fortune came looking for a man worthy to receive her favors, she at once selected him, because he was prepared. It was the same with Washington. When he was an humble guide, in the wilderness, a toiling, surveyor, a provincial sub-officer, he did his duties faithfully, and by a course of conscientious self-discipline and study, fitted himself for the illustrious career which he subsequently achieved.

Family Miscellany.

For the Principia.

THE EARLY DREAM.

She was a child, a very child,
Of gentle grace and air,
With eyes whose radiance, meek and mild,
Might move a soul to prayer.

Her voice was low, and soft, and sweet,
Ne'er raised in strife or jest,
Her step was light, her tiny feet
The heath flower scarcely pressed.

Down shoulders fair, whose snowy mould
The sculptor's art might test,
Flowed waving locks of shining gold,
And glittered on her breast.

But on her forehead, fair and high,
Heaven's signet seal was set,
Oft thought the wondering passer by,
An angel he had met.

I loved her, and her love I won,
She, still a child in years,
Yet grasped, while still 'twas just begun,
Life's destiny of tears.

Not long with girlhood's slender foot
The rough highway she trod,—
To her was given a seraph's lute,
And she went home to God.

They ask me why I love no more,
When gentle maidens pass,
I see as through an open door,
Or in a crystal glass,

A form untouched by time or earth,
(Though men say she is dead),
A being of immortal birth,
To whom my soul is wed.

And down through sorrow's darkest night,
Her eyes gleam like a star,
Her lips illumined with Heaven's own light,
Smile sweetly, though afar.

Still on the night-wind sobbing low,
Stream those fair locks of gold,—
A banner in whose every flow,
Our deathless love is told.

E.

"DON'T STEP THERE."

A layer of snow was spread over the icy streets and the pedestrians walked carefully shod with india-rubber towards the churches, on a cold Sabbath morning in February. Walking somewhat hastily churchward, for I was late, I noticed a bright looking little lad, standing upon the pavement, with his cap in his hand, and his eyes fixed upon one spot in the sidewalk. As I approached him, he looked up to me and pointing to the place, said :

"Please don't step there, sir; I slipped there and fell down."

"I thanked the philanthropic little fellow, and passed round the dangerous spot. "Don't step there," was the theme of my meditations during the remainder of my walk.

There are many places as we journey along the pathway of life, where we slip and fall. How carefully should we ourselves tread past such places in our future journeyings? Yet how often is it lamentable true, that on the same spot we repeat our stumblings! Wherever, under the temptations of the adversary, or through the wrong impulse of my perverse affections and passions, I have once slipped, let me ever afterwards place a watch, which to remind me of my further sad experience, shall cry out to me as I approach "Don't step there!" The friend who truly loves me, and who is rigorously solicitous for my spiritual good, when he sees me carelessly treading on a spot where he has himself fallen, will refer to his own misfortune or fault and kindly say to me, "Don't step there."

And if I cherish benevolent sentiments towards my fallen fellow men, I desire for their own good that they should walk upright; if zeal for the honor of the Church awake solicitude for the consistency and purity of our fellow disciples, shall I not, when I see the feet of any of them near the spot where I myself have fallen, or where I have seen another slip, kindly say to them: "Don't step there?"

Selfishness would hurry away from the place of a fall, muttering, "It is none of my business what becomes of those

who follow." Pride will seek to hide his humiliation. Mischief and malignity would wait for a laugh or a sneer at the coming helpless traveller. But benevolence halts for a little while, to utter a kind warning and to guide a fellow-being against an unhappy calamity.

A thousand times since has the clear voice of that kind hearted child rung in my ear, reminding me of my own duty to those around me, and urging me to repeat, wherever the repetition promises to be useful, "Please don't step there."

ORDER IS ECONOMY.

A writer in the *N. E. Farmer*, with the signature of "Comings," says:—

The great majority of country farmers, who become the positive owners of their homesteads, in New-England, make slow, but steady advances in property. At first, their increase of property is a very small amount yearly. And this small amount, at first, is really the procuring cause of the larger increase which may follow. Without the small increase at first, the larger increase to follow is entirely out of the question. And this small increase, and oftentimes much more, depends upon strict order about the house.

Again, it depends upon strict order about the barn and tool-house; and again, it depends on strict order about the farm.

The positive advancement of most farmers, in property, is within the line of \$50 yearly, if not within that of \$25. If a man can, upon his own farm, make a clear advance of \$50 per year, he may soon become an independent farmer. If he can make a clear advance of \$25 yearly, he has no reason for discouragement. He will have no reason to want to turn shoe-maker, and have to "strike" at his boss. Measure indeed be that house, and limited that family, where strict order will not be worth more than \$25 yearly. In a house where nothing knows its positive place, where you can find nothing without hauling everything over, where every matter is without definite regulations, where arrangements are not a part of a positive system, the waste of substance, the unnecessary wear and tear, with the frettings and frustrations consequent, will soon measure a dead loss of \$100. And all such loss is positively worse than so much money thrown away.

The loss of only ten minutes of time per day, in 312 days, amounts to more than five full days, of ten hours each. At \$1.50 per diem, it would amount to \$7.80. A large portion of laboring men are losers of more than five times ten minutes per day, in time, for want of strict "order about the house." Add to this, the other evils and losses consequent upon a want of strict order, and will it be quite sufficient to keep a poor man. Farmers' wives, if not some other men's wives, may be the mothers of prosperity or poverty, to their households.

Order is economy, at the barn, and all over the farm.

THE SLAVE AND HIS ENEMY.

A slave in one of the West India Islands was noticed by his master, very carefully watching over a poor old broken-down negro, who had been purchased with a lot some days before. He shared his bed with him; fed him at his own table; carried him into the sunshine when cold and into the shade when hot. His tenderness led his master to suppose the old man was some near relative, and he inquired if he were his father.—"No, massa." was the answer. "Is he an elder brother?" "No, massa." "Perhaps your uncle, or some other relation?" "No, massa, no relation, not even friend." "Why then, do you treat him so kindly?" "He is my enemy, massa." replied the slave, "he sold me to the slave-dealer; my Bible tells me, when my enemy hunger, feed him; when he thirst give him drink."

A JEW ON CHRISTIANITY.—It having been assumed in the debate on capital punishment in the New York legislature, that retaliation is the Jewish idea, and forbearance and mercy peculiarly Christian, Samson Falk, a Jewish rabbi, writes in the Albany Evening Journal to controvert this representation. He quotes from the Old Testament the texts requiring forgiveness and mercy, and declares that Christ adopted the doctrine from Moses; but he thinks the Jews have, thus far, had the advantage of the Christians in reducing the idea to practice, and refers to the Catholic inquisition, the Christian wars of opinion, the persecution of the Jews, and the

long catalogue of intolerant and bloody crimes in the Christian church, in contrast with the patient suffering and forbearance of the Jews, to show that the latter have the advantage in what is claimed to be the peculiar excellence and glory of Christianity.—*Springfield Republican*.

We hold that Christianity is the religion of both the Old and New Testaments.—*Principia*.

WHAT ARDENT SPIRITS HAS DONE IN TEN YEARS.—It has cost the nation a direct expense of six hundred million of dollars.

It has cost an indirect expense of six hundred million of dollars.

It has destroyed three hundred thousand lives.

It has sent one hundred thousand children to the poor house.

It has consigned, at least, one hundred and fifty thousand persons to the jail and state prisons.

It has made, at least, one thousand maniacs.

It has instigated to the commission of one thousand five hundred murders.

It has caused two thousand persons to commit suicide.

It has burnt, or otherwise destroyed, property to the amount of at least five millions of dollars.

It has made not less than two hundred thousand widows.

It has made one million orphan children.

It has endangered the inheritance left us by our fathers and fixed a foul blot upon the fair fame of America.

It is more a weakness than a virtue in strong Christians when a weak saint is fallen, to aggravate his fall to the uttermost, and to present his sins in such a dreadful dress as shall amaze him. He who shall lay the same strength in the rubbing of an earthen dish, as he does to the rubbing of a pewter platter, instead of cleaning it will surely break it to pieces. The application is easy.

Much of this World's goods does usually cause great distraction, great vexation, and great condemnation at last to the possessors of them. If God give them in his wrath, and does not sanctify them in his love, they will at last be witnesses against a man, and millstones for ever to sink him in that day when God shall call men to an account, not for the use, but for the abuse of mercy.

As every sacrifice was to be seasoned with salt, so every mercy is to be sanctified by prayer. As gold sometimes is laid, not only on cloth and silk, but also upon silver, a prayer is that golden duty that must be laid, not only upon all our natural and civil actions, as eating, drinking, buying and selling, but also upon all our silver duties, upon all our most religious and spiritual performances.

The world gives a little, that it may give no more; but Christ gives, that it may give." He gives a little grace, that he may give grace upon grace. He gives a little comfort, that he may give fullness of joy. He gives some strength, that he may give full draughts. He gives pence, that he may give pounds; and he gives pounds, that he may give hundreds.

The high honor and glory that earthly princes can put upon their subjects is to communicate to them their greatest secrets. Now this high honor and glory the King of kings hath put upon his people: "For his secrets are with them that fear him, and he will show them his covenant."

'Twas an excellent saying of Ambrose, "If thou canst not hide thyself from the sun, which is God's minister of light, how impossible will it be to hide thyself from him whose eyes are ten thousand times brighter than the sun. Tho' a sinner may baffle his conscience, yet he can not baffle the eye of God's omniscience.'

Pride, passion, and other vices, in these days go armed. Touch them over so gently, yet, like the nettle, they will sting you; and if you deal with them roundly, roughly, and cuttingly, they will turn and taunt you, as the Hebrew did to Moses, "Who made thee judge over us?"

WRITINGS OF WILLIAM GOODELL

For sale at the office of the *Principia*:

DEMOCRACY OF CHRISTIANITY, 2 Vols.,	\$1.50
SLAVERY AND ANTI-SLAVERY (History of) 1 Vol.,	\$1.00
AMERICAN SLAVE CODE, 1 Vol.,	\$0.75

TERMS CASH.

D. D. NICHOLSON, PRINTER, 199 WILLIAM STREET, NEW YORK.

VOL. I.
Published by
Harpers' Bu

TERMS:

Difect bu

as above.
Our object, b
Christian refor
killed crimes
uses, business a
the Church, the
God, restoring t
type of heaven,
our expediency,
us; our panepl
Editors

THE EMBRYO
DECLARAT
TORS.

The Riehn
ocra
chanan, said,
"Until re
great diffi
apologists) to
fense of Slav
the Slavery /
The line of d
now maintai
and does not
laws of the S
Another leadi

"Slavery is
boring man,
Northern Fre
class of mecha
yet clothed wi
ter and slave
parent and ch
introduce it.
sion."

The Richmo
gan, said:

"Repeatedly
periment of un
free society in
among you pro
answer. This
dence added t
furnished, tha

"We repeat
the existence o
generations.

"Two oppo
among civili
give way, and

"If free so
must fall, and
old as the worl

The Richmon

"While it is

"STILL NO A
evidently, to the
mistical and polit
of the slaveholder
all, in fact, except
either unwilling o
ment of the white
mond Enquirer sp